

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
SHRIKUMAR PODDAR, individually and as  
plan administrator and trustee;  
MAYURIKA PODDAR, individually and as  
trustee; VAISHNAVA CENTER FOR  
ENLIGHTENMENT, INC., d.b.a.  
INTERNATIONAL SERVICE SOCIETY; and  
INDIA FOUNDATION, INC. on behalf of  
themselves and all others similarly  
situated,

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiffs,

98 Civ. 1691 (MGC)

-against-

STATE BANK OF INDIA,

Defendant.

-----X  
CEDARBAUM, J.

Plaintiffs move for reconsideration of my June 14, 2006  
order on their motion for class certification. Local Rule 6.3  
requires that those who seek reconsideration demonstrate that the  
court has "overlooked matters or controlling decisions which, had  
they been considered, might reasonably have altered the result."  
Donahue v. Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., 719 F. Supp. 149, 151  
(S.D.N.Y. 1988) (internal quotation marks omitted). A motion for  
reconsideration "is not intended as a vehicle for a party  
dissatisfied with the Court's ruling to advance new theories that  
the movant failed to advance in connection with the underlying  
motion, nor to secure a rehearing on the merits with regard to

issues already decided." Montanile v. Nat'l Broad. Co., 216 F. Supp. 2d 341, 342 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). Because plaintiffs have not satisfied the standard for reconsideration, the motion is denied. Furthermore, plaintiffs' new and vague request for additional discovery is not a ground for reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:      New York, New York  
                July 26, 2006

S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
                          MIRIAM GOLDMAN CEDARBAUM  
                          United States District Judge